



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,831	02/06/2002	Densen Cao	5061.11a P	1007

7590 05/10/2004

Parsons, Behle & Latimer  
Suite 1800  
201 South Main Street  
P.O. Box 45898  
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0898

EXAMINER

LEWIS, RALPH A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/072,831

Applicant(s)

CAO, DENSEN

Examiner

Ralph A. Lewis

Art Unit

3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Rejections based on Obvious-type Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 18-31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,111. The patented claims of 6,331,111 set forth a dental curing light having multiple semiconductor light sources with primary and secondary heat sinks (patented claim 9 sets forth a plurality of primary heat sinks for a plurality of semiconductors) wherein semi conductors have different wave lengths (note patented claim 6). The patented claims of '111 do not explicitly state that the light emitted from the semiconductors overlap forming a foot print, however, the patented claims call for an array of light emitting elements (note e.g. claim 9). One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have oriented the claimed light emitting elements so that the light produced was focused on a particular area, i.e. "overlapping." In fact it would be difficult to provide for an array of elements in such a device that had no overlapping lights (scattered light that would overlap is the reason applicant called for another

embodiment with wells (e.g. claim 2)). To have provided the patented array such that the lights overlapped would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. In regard to the narrower limitations presented in the patented claims, merely setting forth the already patented structure in broader terms would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 18-31 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over

claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/072,852;  
claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/072,853;  
claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/072,859; and  
claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/073,672.

The limitations of the present claims all appear to broader or slightly different obvious versions of the pending claims in the above identified applications. The above identified applications all set forth plural light emitting semi conductor light sources and primary and secondary heat sinks. The over lapping "foot print" limitation would be inherent of plural light source devices. Merely leaving out limitations, providing for different groupings of the elements set forth in the claims of the above identified pending applications and claiming inherent properties (i.e. overlapping footprints) of the other claimed devices would have been obvious to the ordinarily skilled artisan.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Rejections based on Prior Art

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Mills (WO 99/16136).

Mills discloses in Figure 5 a primary heat sink 48 on which light emitting semiconductors 43 are mounted to an elongated secondary heat sink 45. The semiconductors would inherently have overlapping light which overlapping footprint limitations.

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kovac et al (6,200,134).

Kovac et al disclose a light curing device comprised of multiple light emitting semiconductor elements 43 mounted on a primary heat sink 44 and having a secondary

heat sink 64. The closely arranged light emitting semiconductor elements would inherently have overlapping foot prints.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Mills (WO 99/16136) and Kovac et al (US 6,200,134) in view of Decaudin et al (6,692,250)

Decaudin et al teach that it is desirable to use semiconductors of different light emitting frequencies so as to increase the versatility of the dental curing device for applications requiring different spectra's of light. To have increased the versatility of the Mills and Kovac et al devices by using semiconductors of different light emitting frequencies a taught by Decaudin et al would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

#### **Prior Art**

Melikechi et al (6,511,317), Otsuka (6,638,063), Decaudin et al (6,692,250), Logan et al (6,692,251), Plank (6,695,614), and Fischer et al (6,702,576) are made of record.

Art Unit: 3732

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 18-23 requiring a separate primary heat sink for each semiconductor light source would be allowable upon the filing of a terminal disclaimer to overcome the obvious-type double patenting rejections above.


### **Action Made Final**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Ralph Lewis** at telephone number **(703) 308-0770**. Fax (703) 872-9306. The examiner works a compressed work schedule and is unavailable every other Friday. The examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver, can be reached at (703) 308-2582.

R.Lewis  
April 19, 2004

  
Ralph A. Lewis  
Primary Examiner  
AU3732